USDC SDNY DOCUMENT ELECTRONICALLY FILED DOC #: DATE FILED: 12/12/11

MEMO ENDORSED

MDL 1570 PLAINTIFFS' EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES

In re: Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001 (S.D.N.Y)

Plaintiffs' Executive Committee for Personal Injury and Death Claims	Plaintiffs' Executive Committee for Commercial Claims
Ronald L. Motley, <i>Co-Chair</i> MOTLEY RICE I.I.C James P. Kreindler, <i>Co-Chair</i> KREINDLER & KREINDLER LLP	Elliot R. Feldman, Co-Chair Sena Carter, Co-Chair COZEN O'CONNOR
Andrew J. Maloncy III, Co-Liaison Counsel Kreindler & Kreindler i.i.p Paul J. Hanly, Jr., Co-Liaison Counsel Hanly Conroy Bierstein Sheridan Pisher & Hayes i.i.p	J. Scott Tarbutton, <i>Liaison Counsel</i> COZEN O'CONNOR

VIA FACSIMILE

December 7, 2011

to address: The Honorable Frank Maas United States District Court Southern District of New York Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse 500 Pearl Street, Room 740

At the 12/14 conference. I intered address:

a) The 10/26 motion to compeles

b) Pete Sedaghety

c) The 188me regardy reply

Papers.

Hyan, Usmi, 12/12/11

In Re: September 11, 2001 World Trade Center Attack, 03 MDL 1570 (GBD) Re:

Dear Judge Maas:

New York, NY 10007

The Plaintiffs' Executive Committees and the Defendants' Executive Committee, on behalf of the defendants who are currently subject to discovery, respectfully submit their proposals concerning the agenda for the December 14, 2011 discovery conference.

Defendants' Proposed Agenda for December 14, 2011 Status Conference:

There is one pending motion that is ripe for review: Defendants' Letter Application to Compel Plaintiffs to Produce Documents (Oct. 26, 2011), which is fully briefed, including plaintiffs' Opposition (Nov. 21, 2011), and defendants' Reply (Dec. 7, 2011).

Plaintiffs' Proposed Agenda for December 14, 2011 Status Conference:

At the moment, the only item that Plaintiffs know to be presently ripe for the Court's consideration is the issue of the timing for when Pirouz Sedaghaty will comply with the Court's November 21, 2011 order (Docket Entry No. 2491) compelling Sedaghaty to produce documents in response to Plaintiffs' discovery requests. Aside from that issue, Plaintiffs are unaware of any briefing finalized before the Court ripe for review. Accordingly, Plaintiffs do not have any additional issues to address to the Court's attention at this time.

The Honorable Frank Maas, U.S.M.J. December 7, 2011 Page 2

Defendants' Response to Plaintiffs' Proposed Agenda:

Mr. Sedaghaty has sought further review of the November 22, 2011 decision, so that it is premature to discuss the deadlines for his document production.

Plaintiffs' Reply to Defendants' Response:

At the time the parties are discussing the agenda for the December 14 conference, Plaintiffs are unable to determine whether the issue in defendants' October 26 letter application is appropriate for review at the December 14 conference. Although plaintiffs' opposing letter brief was served on the defendants on November 21, 2011, defendants unilaterally opted to delay service of their reply letter brief until the last possible day. Accordingly, as the parties are discussing the items for the agenda, plaintiffs have not seen the reply letter brief and are therefore unable to anticipate the scope of the reply.

Depending on the scope of defendants reply, plaintiffs may have no objection to moving forward with that issue at the December 14, 2011 hearing; alternatively, if defendants' reply is substantially beyond the scope of the defendants' initial submission, plaintiffs reserve the right to request additional time to provide the Court with a sur-reply to address the expanded reply. If that is the case, Plaintiffs would recommend adjourning the issue until the January conference or such other time as the Court may deem appropriate.

Respectfully

Robert T. Haefele

THE MDL 1570 PLAINTIFFS' EXECUTIVE

Alan R. Kabat Byy

COMMITTEES

Alan R. Kabat

THE DEFENDANTS' EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Hon. George B. Daniels (By Federal Express) MDL-1570 counsel (By electronic mail)

cc: